UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,625	01/31/2005	Takashi Imoto	03500.017510.	1853

5514 7590 07/13/2009

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
ZHANG, FAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,625	IMOTO, TAKASHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FAN ZHANG	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *9 and 10* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 11-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 10, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's remarks respective to amended claim 1 have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of a new ground of rejection necessitated by the corresponding amendments.

Response to Amendments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (US Pub: 2002/0036790) and in further view of Ross

JR (US Pub: 2002/0143885) and Ben-Shachar et al (US Pub: 2003/0189599).

Regarding claim 1 (currently amended), Nishiyama teaches: A notifying method of notifying a user of information regarding an image processing apparatus which communicates with an information processing apparatus [figs. 12, 13], said method comprising: a print data transmitting step of transmitting print data to the image processing apparatus [p0071];

an obtaining step of obtaining the information regarding the image processing apparatus, said obtaining step being started by one of the user sessions for a predetermined one of the plurality of users activating a first display program [p0068, p0069, fig. 12: S42]:

a specifying step of specifying an active session from among the user sessions for another of the plurality of users different from the predetermined user [figs. 15-17: User Name & Password entry (The active session of user name & password entry specifies one of a plurality of users to obtain information regarding the image processing apparatus.)];

an activating step of activating a second display program corresponding to the active session specified in said specifying step in order to display the information regarding the image processing apparatus obtained in said obtaining step on the display unit occupied in the specified active session [figs. 15-17, p0072-p0075 (Once user name and pass word are specified in the specifying step, a new display is activated to display the information regarding job status of the image processing apparatus for the specified user.)];

and an information transmitting step of transmitting the information obtained in said obtaining step to the second display program activated in said activating step; and a displaying step of displaying, in response to said information transmitting step transmitting the obtained information, the transmitted information on the display unit occupied in the active session through the second display program [p0070, p0076].

Nishiyama discloses a situation in which a plurality of users simultaneously logon to a plurality of information processing apparatuses and the users could operate the display units of the corresponding apparatuses sequentially or concurrently. Nishiyama does not consider the situation in which a plurality of users simultaneously logon to a single information processing apparatus and is silent about an environment in which a specific user exclusively operates the display unit of the single information processing apparatus.

In the same field of endeavor, Ross JR teaches: a specifying step of specifying an active session from among the user sessions for another of the plurality of users different from the predetermined user, wherein the other user can exclusively operate a display unit of the information processing apparatus and wherein the active session occupies the display unit of the information processing apparatus to which the plurality of users log-on [p0056-p0061]. Having a plurality of users logon to a single computer concurrently and allowing one active display exclusively at a time have been well known in the art as prescribed by Evans et al. Therefore, it would have been an obvious alternative for an ordinary skilled in the art to substitute one single information processing apparatus for a plurality of information processing apparatuses to allow

multiple users to obtain the corresponding image processing information for the purposes of space reservation and resource sharing.

Ross JR teaches activating an email notification display program based on user login through a mouse or a keyboard. Ross JR does not explicitly discuss a pop-up display as suggested by Applicant. In the same field of endeavor, Ben-Shachar et al teach: an activating step of activating a second display program corresponding to the active session specified in said specifying step in order to display the information regarding the image processing apparatus obtained in said obtaining step on the display unit occupied in the specified active session [p0040]. Popping up a display window or message regarding a print job associated with specify issuer/user has been well practiced in the art as prescribed by Ben-Shachar et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teaching of all to allow printing job information to be automatically popped up on a user's screen for the purpose of preventing delay and promptly informing user/issue regarding the status of a printer job with a security measure.

Regarding claim 2 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 1, further comprising: a receiving step of receiving existence information showing that the display program has been activated in the specified active session [p0072-p0075, figs. 14-17]; and an activation discriminating step of discriminating whether the display program has been activated in the specified active

session on the basis of the received existence information [fig. 13: units S52 and S54], wherein said information transmitting step transmits the information obtained in said obtaining step to the display program activated in the specified active session if said activation discrimination step discriminates that the display program has been activated [fig. 13: units S53, S55-S57].

Regarding claim 3 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 1, further comprising a step of, if a plurality of display programs have been activated by the active session specified in said specifying step, finishing one of the plurality of display programs [figs. 4, 9, 12, and 13: END].

Regarding claim 4 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 1, wherein the display program is a program for displaying information regarding a print job issued to the image processing apparatus or information regarding a status of the image processing apparatus [p0067].

Regarding claim 5 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 4 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 4, further comprising: a user specifying step of specifying the user corresponding to the active session in which the display program has been activated;

and an issuance discriminating step of discriminating whether the print job of the user specified in said user specifying step has been issued to the image processing apparatus, wherein if it is determined that the print job has not been issued in said issuance discriminating step, the display program is not activated [p0074]. In Nishiyama's teaching, print jobs are divided between confidential and common. The confidential print display program will not be activated unless user specification and job issued by the user are confirmed. Although a common print status display program is activated, confidential print status display program is not activated as it is discriminated that Tanaka has not issued a print job as exemplified in p0074. However, all the print jobs could be converted to confidential status so that none of the display programs would be activated. Therefore, it would have been an obvious variation of Nishiyama's exemplification for an ordinary skilled in the art to apply confidential print status to all the print jobs so that none of the display programs will be activated when user does not issue a print job for the purpose of simplicity and less confusion.

Regarding claim 6 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 1, further comprising: a necessity discriminating step of discriminating whether the information is information which needs to be displayed on the basis of the information obtained in said obtaining step [fig. 13: units S52 and S54], wherein the display program is activated in the active session specified in said specifying step if said necessity discriminating step discriminates that the information is

the information which needs to be displayed [fig. 13: units S53-57]. Also see [p0067-p0070].

Claim 11 (currently amended) has been analyzed and rejected with regard to claim 1.

Claim 12 (currently amended) has been analyzed and rejected with regard to claim 1 and in accordance with Nishiyama's further teaching on: A computer-readable memory medium which stores a program for controlling an information processing apparatus [p0088].

Regarding claim 14 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teach: A method according to claim 1, wherein said specifying step specifies the active session for the other user different from the predetermined user based on information obtained in a step of obtaining active session information in order to discriminate the active session occupying the display unit used by the other user from the user sessions [figs. 15-17: User Name & Password entry (The active session of user name & password entry specifies one of a plurality of users to obtain information regarding the image processing apparatus.)]. And Ross JR also discloses the above in the rejection of claim 1.

5. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (US Pub: 2002/0036790), Ross JR (US Pub: 2002/0143885), and Ben-Shachar et al (US Pub: 2003/0189599); and in further view of Parry (US Pub: 2003/0077097).

Regarding claim 7 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 1, further comprising: a condition obtaining step of obtaining condition information in which conditions in which the information regarding the image processing apparatus is displayed and conditions in which said information is not displayed have been described [fig. 13, p0067-p0070]. Nishiyama does not execute display based on the status of an apparatus. Ben-Shachar et al on the other hand allows a window to be popped up when a print job has completed [p0040]. In the same field of endeavor, Parry teaches: a status discriminating step of discriminating whether the image processing apparatus is in a status (normal or non-error status) where it is necessary to display the information regarding the image processing apparatus on the basis of said condition information and the information obtained in said obtaining step; and a step of finishing the display program if said status discriminating step discriminates that the image processing apparatus is not in said status [p0041, figs 3. Error message is displayed when the apparatus is not in normal status.]. Discriminating the status of an apparatus to activate a display program has been well known and practiced in the art as prescribed by Parry. Therefore, given Nishiyama and Ross JR's teachings on user condition and identification, Ben-Shachar et al's teaching on pop-up

display, and Parry's disclosure on apparatus status for activating a display program, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teaching of the all to display printing information when both user condition and apparatus status are met for providing user relevant error messages on the related printing jobs.

Claim 8 (previously presented) has been analyzed and rejected with regard to claim 7. (No message is sent to a computer for displaying when it is determined that there is no error associated with the image processing apparatus [fig. 13, p0067-p0070].)

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (US Pub: 2002/0036790) Ross JR (US Pub: 2002/0143885), and Ben-Shachar et al (US Pub: 2003/0189599); and in further view of Hamada (US Pub: 2002/0103885).

Regarding claim 13 (previously presented), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama, Ross JR, and Ben-Shachar et al do not explicitly disclose activating a print service program upon obtaining the information regarding the image processing apparatus. In the same field of endeavor, Hamada teaches: A method according to claim 1, wherein the predetermined user is a user for the user session in which a print service program can be activated in the information processing apparatus upon obtaining the information regarding the image processing apparatus [p0117 (A print service program such as re-sending data is

activated upon obtaining error information regarding a printer once a predetermined user authenticity is checked.)]. Given Nishiyama's prescription on detecting error information of a printer in p0003 and Hamada's disclosure on activating a data re-sending program, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Nishiyama, Ross JR, and Ben-Shachar et al to include a print service program upon obtaining information regarding a printer's status after performing user authentication for providing user an efficient printing process service.

Contact

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fan Zhang whose telephone number is (571) 270-3751. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571) 272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Fan Zhang/

Patent Examiner

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625